

# Large deviations for empirical entropies of $g$ -measures

J.-R. Chazottes<sup>a</sup>   D. Gabrielli<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> CENTRE DE PHYSIQUE THÉORIQUE, CNRS-ECOLE POLYTECHNIQUE  
F-91128 Palaiseau, Cedex, France  
jeanrene@cpht.polytechnique.fr

<sup>b</sup> DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA PURA E APPLICATA  
Università Dell'Aquila, Via Vetoio Loc. Coppito  
67100 L'Aquila, Italia  
gabriell@univaq.it

## Abstract

The entropy of an ergodic finite-alphabet process can be computed from a single typical sample path  $x_1^n$  using the entropy of the  $k$ -block empirical probability and letting  $k$  grow with  $n$  roughly like  $\log n$ . We further assume that the distribution of the process is a  $g$ -measure. We prove large deviation principles for conditional, non-conditional and relative  $k(n)$ -block empirical entropies.

**Key words:** conditional entropy, relative entropy, thermodynamic formalism, types.

**2000 MSC:** 37D35, 60F10

---

We acknowledge the financial support of the Cofin MIUR 2002 prot. 2002027798\_005. We thank the CIC, Cuernavaca, México, for its warm hospitality, where part of this work was done. We also thank A. Galves and D. Guiol for discussions about the entropy estimation problem. This project started when both authors were postdoc fellows at IME-USP (São Paulo) with a FAPESP grant.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A problem of interest is the entropy-estimation problem. Given a sample path  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  (where the  $x_i$ 's are drawn from a finite alphabet  $A$ ) *typical* for an unknown ergodic source, how to estimate its entropy? The simplest idea is to use a "plug-in" estimator. First one computes for *each* block of length  $k$ , the  $k$ -marginals of the source as the limit, when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , of the  $k$ -block *empirical probability* of the sample  $x_1^n$ ; then one can compute the  $k$ -block entropy of the source and let  $k \rightarrow \infty$  to get the entropy of the source. A natural question is thus: how is it possible to choose  $k = k(n)$  to do these two steps at the same time? Ornstein and Weiss [21] (see also [23]) proved that this is indeed possible for any ergodic source of positive entropy if  $k$  does not grow 'too fast' with  $n$ , loosely like  $\log n$ . The proof is based on an 'empirical version' of Shannon-McMillan-Breiman Theorem.

A first result about fluctuations of  $k(n)$ -block empirical entropies, refining Ornstein-Weiss' almost-sure result, was obtained in [16]. In that paper the authors consider chains of infinite order which loose memory exponentially fast. Under additional restrictions on the sequence  $k(n)$  they prove a central limit theorem for the conditional  $k(n)$ -block empirical entropy and they prove also that the rescaled  $k(n)$ -block empirical entropy cannot have Gaussian fluctuations.

In the present paper, we are interested in large deviations for  $k(n)$ -block empirical entropies. To this end we assume that the distribution of the process generating the sample path  $x_1^n$  is a  $g$ -measure for the potential  $\phi = \log g$  (see below for definitions and references). Such a process can be viewed as (a special case of) a chain with complete connections or a chain of infinite order, see e.g. [13, 14]. Another way, especially useful for our concern, to characterize and describe a  $g$ -measure is as a one-dimensional equilibrium state [15, 20].

In this setting, we prove large deviation principles for conditional, non-conditional and relative entropies of the  $k(n)$ -block empirical probability of the sample path  $x_1^n$ , *when  $k(n)$  grows, roughly speaking, like  $\log n$* . This is done for *any*  $g$ -measure.

When the block length  $k$  is fixed, it is easy to obtain a large deviation principle for  $k$ -block empirical entropies by "contraction" of the large deviation principle for the empirical process [6]. This is possible because  $k$ -block entropies are continuous in the weak topology. To prove the result when  $k(n)$  grows with  $n$  we will generalize some classical combinatorial techniques. We will use the *combinatorics of types* to see "how fast we can let  $k$  grow with  $n$ ", and get a condition close to Ornstein-Weiss' one.

The rate functions we obtain are convex and we will compute also their Legendre transform which coincide with the corresponding scaled cumulant generating functions. This will allow to derive some properties of the rate functions and an explicit representation in some cases.

Let us notice that the rate function we obtain for conditional and rescaled non conditional empirical entropy can have a linear part. This unexpected feature is related to the entropy of zero-temperature limit of equilibrium states which can be in general nonzero.

Let us briefly mention that around the problem of entropy estimation other techniques and ideas have been developed. The "plug-in" estimator is only one among several other entropy estimators, see e.g. [7, 9, 22, 23]. We point out that we could have worked in the context of one-dimensional Gibbs measures. An interesting issue is the case of multi-dimensional Gibbs measures since we can no longer use the combinatorics of types.

The present paper is organized as follows. In the next section we record preliminary definitions and notions, in particular on  $g$ -measures and the various entropies under study. In Section 3 we present our main results. In Section 4 we discuss our

results, in particular the form of the rate functions that we obtain for empirical entropies. Section 5 is devoted to the collection of combinatorial tools needed to understand "how fast  $k$  can grow with  $n$ " later on. Section 6 contains the proof of the main results.

## 2. PRELIMINARY DEFINITIONS AND NOTIONS

Let  $A$  be a finite alphabet. We will denote by  $a_1^\infty \stackrel{def}{=} (a_1, a_2, \dots)$  the elements of  $A^\mathbb{N}$  and by  $a_1^k$  the finite string  $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ . We will use the notation  $x_1^n$  for a "sample path"  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $x_i \in A$ . We denote by  $T$  the "shift" operator defined as  $Tx_1^\infty = x_2^\infty$ . The cylinder set  $[a_1^n]$  is the set of infinite strings  $b_1^\infty$  drawn from  $A^\mathbb{N}$  such that  $b_1^n = a_1^n$ .

We call  $\mathcal{M}^k$  the set of probability measures  $\nu_k$  on  $A^k$  and  $\mathcal{M}_s^k$  the set of probability measures  $\nu_k$  on  $A^k$  which satisfy the following stationarity condition

$$\sum_{b \in A} \nu_k(a_1^{k-1}b) = \sum_{b \in A} \nu_k(ba_1^{k-1}) \quad \forall a_1^{k-1} \in A^{k-1}. \quad (2.1)$$

The subset  $\mathcal{M}_s^k$  is convex and  $\mathcal{E}^k$  denotes the set of its extremal elements.

We call  $\mathcal{M}$  the set of probability measures  $\nu$  on  $A^\mathbb{N}$  with the usual sigma-algebra of cylinders. The subset of shift-invariant (or stationary) measures is denoted by  $\mathcal{M}_s$ . The set of ergodic measures (the extremal points of  $\mathcal{M}_s$ ) is denoted by  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Given a measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s$  we will write  $\nu_k$  for its  $k$ -marginals. Of course we have the identity  $\nu_k(a_1^k) = \nu([a_1^k])$  for any  $a_1^k \in A^k$  and consequently  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_s^k$ .

**2.1.  $g$ -measures and equilibrium states.** In this paper we deal with  $g$ -measures associated to continuous and regular  $g$ -functions. We refer the reader to [19, 20, 26] for full details about the following material.

Let  $g$  be a continuous function on  $A^\mathbb{N}$  satisfying

$$\sum_{b_1^\infty: Tb_1^\infty = a_1^\infty} g(b_1^\infty) = 1 \quad \text{for all } a_1^\infty \in A^\mathbb{N}. \quad (2.2)$$

We further assume that  $g$  is strictly positive (this implies  $g < 1$  by (2.2)). We associate to such a function a potential, normalized according to (2.2), by setting

$$\phi \stackrel{def}{=} \log g. \quad (2.3)$$

Observe that  $\phi < 0$ . A  $g$ -measure can be defined as an equilibrium state for the potential  $\phi$ . We measure the continuity of  $\phi$  by the sequence of its variations  $(\text{var}_m(\phi))_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ :

$$\text{var}_m(\phi) \stackrel{def}{=} \sup\{|\phi(a_1^\infty) - \phi(b_1^\infty)| : a_1^m = b_1^m\}. \quad (2.4)$$

Notice that (uniform) continuity of  $\phi$  (with respect to the canonical distance metrizing product topology) is equivalent to  $\text{var}_m(\phi) \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

It is well-known that if  $\text{var}_m(\phi)$  decreases to 0 fast enough, then there is a unique  $g$ -measure which is the unique equilibrium state for  $\phi$ . For instance, if this decreasing is exponential [1] or more generally summable [26]. On another hand, an example of non-uniqueness was given by Bramson and Kalikow [4]. In that example,  $\text{var}_m(\phi) \geq \frac{C}{\log m}$ . Very recently the authors of [2] showed that square-summability of variations, ensuring uniqueness [18], is tight. Let us mention a uniqueness criterion based on a "one-sided" Dobrushin condition involving oscillations of the potential instead of variations [14].

From now on, we fix one of the  $g$ -measures associated to  $\phi$  and denote it by  $\rho$ . For all  $n \geq 1$  and  $a_1^\infty \in A^\mathbb{N}$ , we have the following property

$$e^{-n\varepsilon_n} \leq \frac{\rho([a_1^n])}{\exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \phi(a_j^\infty)\right)} \leq e^{n\varepsilon_n} \quad (2.5)$$

where  $(\varepsilon_n)_n$  is a sequence of non-negative real numbers decreasing to 0.

For  $k \geq 2$ , let  $\rho^{(k)}$  be the  $(k-1)$ -step Markov approximation of  $\rho$ , that is, the (unique) equilibrium state of the cylindrical potential

$$\phi_k(a_1^\infty) = \phi_k(a_1^k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \frac{\rho([a_1^k])}{\rho([a_2^k])}.$$

When  $k = 1$ ,  $\rho^{(1)}$  is the Bernoulli measure for the potential  $\phi_1(a_1^\infty) = \phi_1(a_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \rho(a_1)$ . We can see  $\phi_k$  also as a function on  $A^k$ .

We have the following property

$$\|\phi - \phi_k\|_\infty \leq \text{var}_k(\phi). \quad (2.6)$$

This implies the statement that for all  $a_1^\infty \in A^\mathbb{N}$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log \frac{\rho([a_1^k])}{\rho([a_2^k])} = \phi(a_1^\infty)$$

uniformly.

We shall use the variational principle repeatedly. Let  $\psi : A^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function. Then:

$$\sup\{\mathbb{E}_\eta[\psi] + h(\eta) : \eta \in \mathcal{M}_s\} = P_{\text{top}}(\psi). \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, the supremum is attained if and only if  $\eta$  is an equilibrium state of  $\psi$ .  $P_{\text{top}}(\psi)$  is the topological pressure of  $\psi$ . It is defined as

$$P_{\text{top}}(\psi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{a_1^n} \exp\left(\sup\left\{\sum_{j=1}^n \psi(b_j^\infty) : b \in [a_1^n]\right\}\right). \quad (2.8)$$

Coming back to a normalized potential  $\phi = \log g$ , we have  $P_{\text{top}}(\phi) = 0$ . This can be seen, for instance, by plugging (2.5) in (2.8). The variational principle then tells us that

$$h(\rho) = -\mathbb{E}_\rho[\phi]. \quad (2.9)$$

In particular, the entropy of a  $g$ -measure is always strictly positive.

We shall also consider multiples of the potential  $\phi$ , that is potentials of the form  $\beta\phi$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . When  $\beta \neq 1$ , such potentials have no reason to be normalized as  $\phi$  is, i.e. the corresponding equilibrium states are not  $g$ -measures. But this does not matter for us in the sense that we will only deal with equilibrium states of  $\beta\phi$  that we will indicate with  $\rho_{\beta\phi}$ .

**Remark.** A  $g$ -measure is also named a chain of infinite order or a chain with complete connections, see e.g. [13], [14] for recent accounts. See also [17]. In probabilistic terms, a chain of infinite order, or a chain with complete connections, is a process characterized by transition probabilities that depend on the whole past in a continuous manner. A  $g$ -measure can also be interpreted as a one-dimensional Gibbs measure if the variations go to 0 exponentially fast [15].

**2.2. Entropies.** The  $k$ -block ( $k \geq 1$ ) Shannon entropy is defined as

$$H_k(\nu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \sum_{a_1^k} \nu([a_1^k]) \log \nu([a_1^k]) = H_k(\nu_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \sum_{a_1^k} \nu_k(a_1^k) \log \nu_k(a_1^k).$$

The conditional  $k$ -block ( $k \geq 2$ ) entropy is defined as

$$h_k(\nu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \sum_{a_1^k} \nu([a_1^k]) \log \frac{\nu([a_1^k])}{\nu([a_1^{k-1}])} = h_k(\nu_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \sum_{a_1^k} \nu_k(a_1^k) \log \nu_k(a_k | a_1^{k-1})$$

where  $\nu_k(a_k | a_1^{k-1})$  is the conditional probability  $\nu_k(a_1^k) / \sum_b \nu_k(a_1^{k-1}b)$ . We have the relation

$$h_k(\nu) = H_k(\nu) - H_{k-1}(\nu), k \geq 1$$

where by convention we set  $H_0(\nu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ . Hence  $h_1(\nu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H_1(\nu)$ . Note that  $h_k(\cdot)$  is a concave function on  $\mathcal{M}^k$ .

It is well-known that if  $\nu$  is a stationary measure, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k(\nu) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H_k(\nu)}{k} = h(\nu)$$

where  $h(\nu)$  is the (Shannon-Kolmogorov-Sinai) entropy of  $\nu$ .

The  $k$ -block ( $k \geq 1$ ) relative entropy of a stationary measure  $\nu$  with respect to a  $g$ -measure  $\rho$  is defined as

$$D_k(\nu|\rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a_1^k} \nu([a_1^k]) \log \frac{\nu([a_1^k])}{\rho([a_1^k])} = D_k(\nu_k|\rho_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a_1^k} \nu_k(a_1^k) \log \frac{\nu_k(a_1^k)}{\rho_k(a_1^k)}.$$

The map  $D_k(\cdot|\rho_k)$  is convex on  $\mathcal{M}^k$ . The conditional  $k$ -block ( $k \geq 1$ ) relative entropy is defined as

$$\Delta_k(\nu|\rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_k(\nu|\rho) - D_{k-1}(\nu|\rho) = \Delta_k(\nu_k|\rho_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_k(\nu_k|\rho_k) - D_{k-1}(\nu_{k-1}|\rho_{k-1}).$$

Where we set  $D_0(\nu|\rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ . This imposes  $\Delta_1(\nu|\rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_1(\nu|\rho)$ .

The relative entropy  $h(\nu|\rho)$  between  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s$  and a  $g$ -measure  $\rho$  is defined as

$$h(\nu|\rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} D_k(\nu|\rho) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_k(\nu|\rho) \quad \text{and} \quad h(\nu|\rho) = -\mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi] - h(\nu). \quad (2.10)$$

By the variational principle, it is obvious that  $h(\nu|\rho) = 0$  if, and only if,  $\nu$  is an equilibrium state of  $\phi$ . (See [6] for more details.)

**2.3. Empirical measures and entropies.** Given a finite string (a “sample path”)  $x_1^n$  we define the empirical measures

$$\pi_k(a_1^k; x_1^n) = \pi_{k,n}(a_1^k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\tilde{x}_i^{i+k-1} = a_1^k)}{n}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}$$

where  $\tilde{x}_1^\infty \in A^\mathbb{N}$  is the periodic, with period  $n$ , sample path  $(x_1^n x_1^n x_1^n \dots)$ .

It is easy to see that  $\pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n) \in \mathcal{M}_s^k$ . The family of probability measures  $(\pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is consistent in the sense that

$$\sum_{a_j} \pi_j(a_1^j; x_1^n) = \pi_{j-1}(a_1^{j-1}; x_1^n), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}$$

and are the marginals of the empirical process  $\pi(\cdot; x_1^n)$  defined as

$$\pi(S; x_1^n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{T^i \tilde{x}_1^\infty}(S) \quad (2.11)$$

where  $S$  is any measurable subset of  $A^\mathbb{N}$ .

We can now define the following plug-in estimators for entropies.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $x_1^n \in A^n$  be a sample path. The  $k$ -block empirical entropy is defined as

$$\hat{H}_k(x_1^n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H_k(\pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n)).$$

The conditional  $k$ -block empirical entropy is defined as

$$\hat{h}_k(x_1^n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_k(\pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n)).$$

The relative  $k$ -block empirical entropy with respect to a measure  $\rho$  is defined as

$$\hat{D}_k(x_1^n | \rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_k(\pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n) | \rho_k).$$

The relative conditional  $k$ -block empirical entropy with respect to a measure  $\rho$  is defined as

$$\hat{\Delta}_k(x_1^n | \rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta_k(\pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n) | \rho_k).$$

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

We are now ready to state the main results of this paper.

**Theorem 3.1** (Large deviation principles for empirical entropies). Let  $x_1^n$  be a sample path distributed according to a  $g$ -measure  $\rho$ . Assume that  $(k(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  diverges and eventually satisfies

$$k(n) \leq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\log |A|} \log n \quad (3.1)$$

for some  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ . Then the conditional empirical entropy  $\hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)$  satisfies the following large deviation principle:

For any closed set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \rho \left\{ x_1^n : \hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n) \in C \right\} \leq -\inf \{ \mathbf{I}(u) : u \in C \}.$$

For any open set  $O \subset \mathbb{R}$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \rho \left\{ x_1^n : \hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n) \in O \right\} \geq -\inf \{ \mathbf{I}(u) : u \in O \}$$

where the convex rate function  $\mathbf{I}$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{I}(u) = \begin{cases} \inf \{ h(\nu | \rho) : \nu \in \mathcal{M}_s : h(\nu) = u \} & u \in [0, \log |A|] \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

The same large deviation principle holds if we replace  $\hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)$  by the rescaled empirical entropy  $\frac{\hat{H}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)}{k(n)}$ .

**Theorem 3.2** (Large deviations for empirical relative entropies). Let  $x_1^n$  be a sample path distributed according to a  $g$ -measure  $\rho$ . Suppose that  $(k(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  diverges and eventually satisfies  $k(n) \leq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\log |A|} \log n$ , for some  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ . Then the empirical relative entropies  $\hat{\Delta}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho)$  and  $\frac{1}{k(n)} \hat{D}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho)$  satisfy a large deviation principle as in Theorem 3.1 but with the rate function

$$\mathbf{J}(u) = \begin{cases} u & u \in [0, -\inf \{ \mathbb{E}_\eta[\phi] : \eta \in \mathcal{E} \}] \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

These theorems are proved in Section 6. Their proof relies in an essential way upon combinatorial properties of types and a continuity property of entropy which are established in Section 5.

The following proposition deals with the case of fixed block length. The preceding theorems extend this proposition to the case when  $k(n)$  is allowed to grow with  $n$  according to (3.1).

**Proposition 3.3** (Large deviations for fixed block length). *Let  $x_1^n$  be a sample path distributed according to a  $g$ -measure  $\rho$ . Then, for each  $k \geq 1$ , the empirical entropies  $\frac{1}{k}\hat{H}_k(x_1^n)$ ,  $\hat{h}_k(x_1^n)$ ,  $\frac{1}{k}\hat{D}_k(x_1^n)$  and  $\hat{\Delta}_k(x_1^n)$  satisfy a LDP with normalizing factor  $\frac{1}{n}$  and rate functions respectively given by*

$$\mathbf{I}_k^H(u) = \inf\{h(\nu|\rho) : H_k(\nu)/k = u\}, \quad \mathbf{I}_k^h(u) = \inf\{h(\nu|\rho) : h_k(\nu) = u\}$$

$$\mathbf{I}_k^D(u) = \inf\{h(\nu|\rho) : D(\nu_k|\rho_k)/k = u\}, \quad \mathbf{I}_k^\Delta(u) = \inf\{h(\nu|\rho) : \Delta(\nu_k|\rho_k) = u\}$$

where the infima are taken over  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s$ . The infimum over an empty set is taken equal to  $+\infty$  following the usual convention.

This proposition is a direct consequence of the contraction principle and suggests that the rate functions we can expect when we consider  $k(n)$  growing with  $n$  are “contracted” relative entropies. Note that the rate functions of Proposition 3.3 need not be convex.

From the convexity of  $\mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{J}$  we know that they are in Legendre duality with the corresponding scaled cumulant generating function for the different empirical entropies. In the next two propositions we give the expression of the scaled cumulant generating function for empirical entropies and empirical relative entropies.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 hold. Then the rate function  $\mathbf{I}$  is in Legendre duality with the convex function  $t \mapsto \mathbf{R}(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , defined as*

$$\mathbf{R}(t) = \begin{cases} (t+1)P_{top}(\phi/(t+1)) & \text{for } t > -1 \\ \sup\{\mathbb{E}_\eta[\phi] : \eta \in \mathcal{E}\} & \text{for } t \leq -1. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ e^{nt\hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)} \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ e^{nt \frac{\hat{H}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)}{k(n)}} \right] = \mathbf{R}(t). \quad (3.5)$$

Using (2.5) it is easy to check that

$$\mathbf{R}(t) = (t+1) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{a_1^n \in A^n} \rho([a_1^n])^{\frac{1}{t+1}} \quad \text{for } t > -1. \quad (3.6)$$

This resembles a Rényi entropy.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2 hold. Then the rate function  $\mathbf{J}$  is in Legendre duality with the convex function  $t \mapsto \mathbf{P}^\Delta(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , defined as*

$$\mathbf{P}^\Delta(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} (1-t) \inf\{\mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi] : \nu \in \mathcal{E}\} & t > 1 \\ 0 & t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ e^{nt\hat{\Delta}_{k(n)}(x_1^n|\rho)} \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ e^{nt \frac{\hat{D}_{k(n)}(x_1^n|\rho)}{k(n)}} \right] = \mathbf{P}^\Delta(t) \quad (3.7)$$

Let us introduce

$$h_\infty \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} h(\rho_{\beta\phi}). \quad (3.8)$$

The existence of this limit will be shown below (Lemma 6.1). In general  $h_\infty$  can be strictly positive and we stress that it is equal to  $\log |A|$  for the uniform Bernoulli measure.

In the case when  $\mathbf{R}$  is a strictly convex, continuously differentiable function on  $] -1, +\infty[$ , we can improve the results of Theorem 3.1. A large class of  $g$ -measures satisfies this property, namely those associated to potentials with square summable variations.

**Proposition 3.6** (More on large deviations). *In addition to assumptions of Theorem 3.1, assume that the variations of  $\phi$  are square summable. Then  $\mathbf{I}$  is strictly convex on  $[h_\infty, \log |A|]$ , with a unique minimum, where it assumes the value 0, at  $u = h(\rho)$ . Moreover it admits the following representation:*

$$\mathbf{I}(u) = h(\rho_{\beta_u \phi} | \rho_\phi) \quad \text{for } u \in [h_\infty, \log |A|] \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\beta_u \geq 0$  is the unique solution of the equation  $h(\rho_{\beta \phi}) = u$ . On the interval  $[0, h_\infty]$  the function  $\mathbf{I}$  is linear

$$\mathbf{I}(u) = -u - \sup\{\mathbb{E}_\eta[\phi] : \eta \in \mathcal{E}\}$$

#### 4. COMMENTS ON THE RESULTS

We make some comments on the above results.

**Zero-temperature limit and non-differentiability of  $\mathbf{R}$  at  $-1$ .** By using a classical formula for the derivative of the pressure [19], it is straightforward to see that the right derivative of  $t \mapsto \mathbf{R}(t)$  at  $-1$ , when the variations of  $\phi$  are square summable, is equal to

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} (P_{\text{top}}(\beta \phi) - \beta \mathbb{E}_{\rho_\beta}[\phi])$$

where we recall that  $\rho_{\beta \phi}$  is the equilibrium state of the potential  $\beta \phi$ . By the variational principle, we thus get that

$$\lim_{t \downarrow -1} \frac{d\mathbf{R}(t)}{dt} = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} h(\rho_{\beta \phi}) = h_\infty.$$

This limit is not zero in general, therefore the function  $\mathbf{R}$  is not differentiable at  $t = -1$ . Notice that this is related to zero-temperature limit of equilibrium states.

**About the route to large deviations.** Let us emphasize that we prove our large deviation bounds directly. Another way to prove large deviation principles is to first prove the existence of the corresponding scaled cumulant generating function, and then to apply Gärtner-Ellis Theorem (see e.g. [11]). To that end one needs to prove, e.g., that the scaled cumulant generating function is differentiable and strictly convex. We could do that under the assumption that the potential of the  $g$ -measure has square-summable variations. But, as (3.4) shows, the scaled cumulant generating function is not differentiable at  $-1$  in the case  $h_\infty \neq 0$ . Therefore one cannot apply Gärtner-Ellis theorem. Notice also that the rate functionals of Proposition 3.3 can be in general non convex. This means that even in the case when  $k$  is fixed Gärtner-Ellis theorem may not apply.

We want to stress that with our approach we need not to assume anything on the rate of convergence to zero of the variations of the potential.

**On the growth condition (3.1).** A look at the proof of Theorem 3.1 reveals that we actually have a little bit more general condition on  $k(n)$ . In fact we could impose, e.g.,

$$\frac{(\log n)^2 |A|^{k(n)}}{n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We feel that condition (3.1) is more appealing and it is related to the condition which appears in the laws of large numbers for empirical entropies (see below).

**Flatness of  $\mathbf{I}$ .** If  $\rho$  is not the unique equilibrium state of  $\phi$ , it is easy to see that the rate function  $\mathbf{I}$  can be identically zero in some interval containing  $h(\rho)$ . Indeed, the set of equilibrium states of  $\phi$  form a Choquet simplex and the map  $\nu \mapsto h(\nu)$  is convex affine [19] on the set of shift-invariant measures. Hence, there is



an equilibrium state  $\rho_1$  (maybe equal to  $\rho$ ) such that  $h(\rho_1)$  minimizes the entropy among all equilibrium states of  $\phi$ . It may be not unique but this does not matter: we call  $h_1$  this minimal entropy. We do the same for the maximal entropy and call  $h_2$  the corresponding value (maybe equal to  $h(\rho)$ ). Then, it is easy to verify that  $\mathbf{I}(u) = 0$  for all  $u \in [h_1, h_2]$  since  $\mathbf{I}(h_1) = \mathbf{I}(h_2) = 0$  (by the variational principle) and  $\mathbf{I}$  is convex and positive.

**Strong laws of large numbers for empirical entropies.** If  $\rho$  is the unique equilibrium state of  $\phi$  (e.g. when  $\phi$  has square-summable variations), then 0 is the minimum of  $\mathbf{I}$  and it is attained only at  $u = h(\rho)$  (this is an immediate consequence of the variational principle). We can use Theorem 3.1 and apply Borel-Cantelli Lemma to obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k(n)} \hat{H}_{k(n)}(x_1^n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n) = h(\rho) \quad \rho - a.s.$$

Therefore, we recover in our context the Ornstein-Weiss almost-sure result cited in the introduction, with a  $k(n)$  allowed to grow a little bit less fast and stronger hypotheses on the source  $\rho$ . A similar statement, in probability, can be deduced from the results of [16]. The almost-sure convergence of conditional empirical entropy in the case of an ergodic measure  $\nu$  with positive entropy can be proved under the condition that  $k(n) \leq \frac{1-\varepsilon}{h(\nu)} \log n$  (and  $k(n) \rightarrow \infty$ ), for some  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ . If  $\varepsilon = 0$ , this almost-sure convergence fails in general [24].

The same argument applied to the statement of Theorem 3.2 leads to the almost-sure convergence of empirical relative entropies to zero

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\Delta}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k(n)} \hat{D}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho) = 0 \quad \rho - a.s.$$

A similar result in probability for  $\sqrt{n} \hat{D}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho)$  appears in [16] with more assumptions on  $k(n)$ .

**Connection with central limit asymptotics.** Theorem 3.2 has its own interest, but it is also connected with the central limit asymptotics of conditional empirical entropy [16] as follows. The following decomposition holds (see [16]):

$$\hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n) - h(\rho) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (\phi(T^j x_1^\infty) - \mathbb{E}_\rho[\phi]) - \hat{\Delta}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho) + \mathcal{C}_n \quad (4.1)$$

where the correction term  $\mathcal{C}_n$  is such that  $|\mathcal{C}_n| \leq C \text{var}_{k(n)}(\phi)$  and  $x_1^\infty \in [x_1^n]$ . In words, the conditional empirical entropy is equal to the empirical average of the potential  $-\phi$ , plus a term due to the conditional empirical relative entropy between the empirical measure and the "true" measure, and plus a correction.

In [16], the authors assume that the variations of  $\phi$  decrease exponentially fast. They show, under appropriate assumptions on the way  $k(n)$  is allowed to grow, that  $\sqrt{n} \hat{\Delta}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho)$  goes to zero in  $\rho$ -probability, as well as  $\sqrt{n} \mathcal{C}_n$ . Therefore, they can conclude that the central limit theorem for  $\hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n) - h(\rho)$  is equivalent to the central limit theorem for  $-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(T^j x_1^\infty) - \mathbb{E}_\rho[-\phi]$ . In particular, the variance is given by

$$\sigma^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ \left( \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(T^j x_1^\infty) - n \mathbb{E}_\rho[\phi] \right)^2 \right]. \quad (4.2)$$

At large deviation scale it is possible to see that term  $\mathcal{C}_n$  is irrelevant, but not  $\hat{\Delta}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho)$ .

In fact large deviations for  $\hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)$  are different from large deviations for  $-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(T^j x_1^\infty)$ . The latter have the same large deviations as  $-\frac{1}{n} \log \rho([x_1^n])$ . Indeed, it is easy to check (using (2.5) and (2.8)) that for any real  $t$

$$\Phi(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ e^{-t \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T^j} \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{a_1^n \in A^n} \rho([a_1^n])^{1-t} = P_{\text{top}}((1-t)\phi).$$

The common rate function for  $(-\frac{1}{n} \log \rho([x_1^n]))_n$  and  $(-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \phi(T^j x_1^\infty))_n$  is then given by the Legendre transform of  $\Phi$ .

In [8], it is proved that  $\sigma^2 = \frac{d^2 \Phi}{dt^2}(0) = \frac{d^2 P_{\text{top}}(t\phi)}{dt^2}(0)$ . On another hand, one expects that the second derivative of the scaled cumulant generating function at 0 (or, equivalently, the inverse of the second derivative at  $h(\rho)$  of the rate function) equals the variance <sup>(1)</sup>. Though  $\mathbf{R}(t) \neq \Phi(t)$  for all  $t \neq 0$ , a simple computation shows that  $\frac{d^2 \mathbf{R}}{dt^2}(0) = \frac{d^2 P_{\text{top}}(t\phi)}{dt^2}(0) = \sigma^2$ .

Therefore, we have distinct rate functions (because the conditional empirical relative entropy “correction” contributes at large deviation scale) but their second derivative at 0 coincide.

**Remark.** Using (4.1), the fact that  $\hat{\Delta}_{k(n)}(x_1^n | \rho) \geq 0$ , and the fact that  $\mathcal{C}_n$  is irrelevant at large deviation scale, it is easy to get that

$$\mathbf{R}(t) \leq \Phi(t) \quad \forall t > 0, \quad \mathbf{R}(t) \geq \Phi(t) \quad \forall t < 0.$$

## 5. SOME COMBINATORIAL TOOLS

In this section we collect some definitions and lemmas about types, as well as a continuity lemma for conditional entropy. These are essential ingredients for the proofs of our main results which are in the next section. The proof of the following lemmas are given in Section 7

We call  $\mathcal{U}^k(A^n)$  the subset of  $\mathcal{M}_s^k$  whose elements can be obtained as empirical measure of sample paths of length  $n$ . Formally we set

$$\mathcal{U}^k(A^n) = \{\nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_s^k : \exists x_1^n \in A^n \text{ s.t. } \nu_k(\cdot) = \pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n)\}. \quad (5.1)$$

The set  $A^n$  of sample paths  $x_1^n$  can be partitioned into equivalence classes called types. The equivalence relation  $\sim_k$  is defined as

$$x_1^n \sim_k y_1^n \Leftrightarrow \pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n) = \pi_k(\cdot; y_1^n). \quad (5.2)$$

Let us call  $\mathcal{T}^k(A^n) = A^n / \sim_k$  the quotient space. Elements of  $\mathcal{T}^k(A^n)$  are labeled with the corresponding empirical measure  $\pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n)$ , this means that there is a bijective correspondence between  $\mathcal{T}^k(A^n)$  and  $\mathcal{U}^k(A^n)$ . We call  $\tau_{\pi_k, n} \in \mathcal{T}^k(A^n)$  the type corresponding to  $\pi_k(\cdot; x_1^n)$ .

We recall that with  $\mathcal{E}^k$  we indicate the extremal elements of  $\mathcal{M}_s^k$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Given a measure  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{E}^k$  then  $h_k(\nu_k) = 0$ .*

**Lemma 5.2.** *Given a measure  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_s^k$  there exists a measure  $\mu_k \in \mathcal{U}^k(A^n)$  such that*

$$\|\mu_k - \nu_k\|_{\text{tv}} = \sum_{a_1^k \in A^k} |\mu_k(a_1^k) - \nu_k(a_1^k)| \leq \frac{(k+2)|A|^k}{n} \quad (5.3)$$

**Lemma 5.3.** *The following inequalities hold*

$$|\mathcal{T}^k(A^n)| = |\mathcal{U}^k(A^n)| \leq (n+1)^{|A|^k} \quad (5.4)$$

$$|\{x_1^n \in \tau_{\pi_k, n}\}| \leq (n-1)e^{n h_k(\pi_k, n)} \quad (5.5)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Notice that this does not imply a central limit theorem even under real analyticity, see [5].

$$|\{x_1^n \in \tau_{\pi_{k,n}}\}| \geq (en)^{-2|A|^k} e^{nh_k(\pi_{k,n})} \quad (5.6)$$

**Lemma 5.4.** *We have the following continuity property of the conditional  $k$ -block entropy:*

$$\sup_{\{\nu_k, \mu_k : \|\nu_k - \mu_k\|_{tv} \leq \delta\}} |h_k(\nu_k) - h_k(\mu_k)| \leq -2\delta \log \frac{\delta}{|A|^k} \quad (5.7)$$

provided that  $\delta \leq e^{-1}$ .

## 6. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

**6.1. Proof of Theorem 3.1.** Consider a closed set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . We have

$$\rho\{x_1^n : \hat{h}_k(x_1^n) \in C\} = \sum_{\{x_1^n : \hat{h}_k(x_1^n) \in C\}} \rho([x_1^n]).$$

From (2.5) and (2.6) we get

$$\rho([x_1^n]) = e^{n\{\mathbb{E}_{\pi_k(\cdot, x_1^n)}[\phi_k]\}} \vartheta_{k,n}(x_1^n) \quad (6.1)$$

where

$$e^{-n(\varepsilon_n + \text{var}_k(\phi))} \leq \vartheta_{k,n}(x_1^n) \leq e^{n(\varepsilon_n + \text{var}_k(\phi))}. \quad (6.2)$$

Hence we have

$$\sum_{\{x_1^n : \hat{h}_k(x_1^n) \in C\}} \rho([x_1^n]) \leq e^{n(\varepsilon_n + \text{var}_k(\phi))} \times \sum_{\{\pi_{k,n} \in \mathcal{U}^k(A^n) : h_k(\pi_{k,n}) \in C\}} |\{x_1^n \in \tau_{\pi_{k,n}}\}| e^{n\{\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{k,n}}[\phi_k]\}}$$

where we have used types defined in Section 5. Let us call

$$h_k^{-1}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_s^k : h_k(\nu_k) \in C\} \quad \text{and} \quad h^{-1}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s : h(\mu) \in C\}.$$

Using inequalities (5.4)-(5.5) we obtain the following upper bound

$$\sum_{\{x_1^n : \hat{h}_k(x_1^n) \in C\}} \rho([x_1^n]) \leq e^{n(\varepsilon_n + \text{var}_k(\phi))} (n+1)^{|A|^k} (n-1) \exp\left(n \left\{ \sup_{\nu_k \in h_k^{-1}(C)} (\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k}[\phi_k] + h_k(\nu_k)) \right\}\right). \quad (6.3)$$

If we consider sequences  $(k(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  that satisfy the growth condition (3.1) we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \rho\{x_1^n : \hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n) \in C\} \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\nu_k \in h_k^{-1}(C)} (\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k}[\phi_k] + h_k(\nu_k)).$$

We will prove that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists an integer  $K$  such that for any  $k > K$  and for any  $\nu_k \in h_k^{-1}(C)$  there exists a  $\mu \in h^{-1}(C)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k}[\phi_k] + h_k(\nu_k) \leq h(\mu) + \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\phi] + \varepsilon. \quad (6.4)$$

The arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$  will imply the first statement of the theorem.

To prove formula (6.4) we have only to take  $\mu$  as the unique  $(k-1)$ -step Markov extension of  $\nu_k$  and  $K$  such that  $\text{var}_K(\phi) < \varepsilon$ .

Let us now prove the lower bound. Consider an open set  $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ .

$$\sum_{\{x_1^n : \hat{h}_k(x_1^n) \in O\}} \rho([x_1^n]) \geq e^{-n(\varepsilon_n + \text{var}_k(\phi))} \times \sum_{\{\pi_{k,n} \in \mathcal{U}^k(A^n) : h_k(\pi_{k,n}) \in O\}} |\{x_1^n \in \tau_{\pi_{k,n}}\}| e^{n\{\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{k,n}}[\phi_k]\}} \quad (6.5)$$

Using inequality (5.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{x_1^n : \hat{h}_k(x_1^n) \in O\}} \rho([x_1^n]) \geq \\ & e^{-n(\varepsilon_n + \text{var}_k(\phi))} (en)^{-2|A|^k} \sum_{\{\pi_{k,n} \in \mathcal{U}^k(A^n) : h_k(\pi_{k,n}) \in O\}} e^{n\{h_k(\pi_{k,n}) + \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{k,n}}[\phi_k]\}} \geq \\ & e^{-n(\varepsilon_n + \text{var}_k(\phi))} (en)^{-2|A|^k} \exp \left( n \left\{ \sup_{\{\nu_k \in h_k^{-1}(O) \cap \mathcal{U}^k(A^n)\}} (h_k(\nu_k) + \mathbb{E}_{\nu_k}[\phi_k]) \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If we consider sequences  $(k(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which satisfy the growth condition (3.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \rho \left\{ x_1^n : \hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n) \in O \right\} \geq \\ & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\{\nu_{k(n)} \in h_{k(n)}^{-1}(O) \cap \mathcal{U}^{k(n)}(A^n)\}} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\nu_{k(n)}}[\phi_{k(n)}] + h_{k(n)}(\nu_{k(n)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We will prove that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and for any  $\mu \in h^{-1}(O)$  there exists a  $\pi_{k(n),n} \in h_{k(n)}^{-1}(O) \cap \mathcal{U}^{k(n)}(A^n)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{k(n),n}}[\phi_{k(n)}] + h_{k(n)}(\pi_{k(n),n}) \geq h(\mu) + \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\phi] - \varepsilon.$$

The arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$  implies the second statement of theorem 3.1.

When  $n$  is large enough  $|h_{k(n)}(\mu_{k(n)}) - h(\mu)|$  can become arbitrarily small and from lemmas 5.2 and 5.4, if  $d_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (k(n) + 2) \frac{|A|^{k(n)}}{n}$ , there exists a measure  $\pi_{k(n),n} \in \mathcal{U}^{k(n)}(A^n)$  such that

$$|h_{k(n)}(\mu_{k(n)}) - h_{k(n)}(\pi_{k(n),n})| \leq -2d_n \log \frac{d_n}{|A|^{k(n)}}.$$

For a sequence  $(k(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which satisfy the growth condition (3.1) both  $d_n$  and  $-2d_n \log \frac{d_n}{|A|^{k(n)}}$  converge to zero. Since  $O$  is an open set we obtain that if  $n$  is large enough there exists a  $\pi_{k(n),n} \in h_{k(n)}^{-1}(O) \cap \mathcal{U}^{k(n)}(A^n)$  and such that  $|h_{k(n)}(\pi_{k(n),n}) - h(\mu)|$  is arbitrarily small. It is also easy to show that

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mu}(\phi) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{k(n),n}}(\phi_{k(n)})| \leq \text{var}_{k(n)}(\phi) + d_n \|\phi\|_{\infty}.$$

The statement easily follows.

The proof for the estimator  $\frac{\hat{H}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)}{k(n)}$  is analogous; we will only point out the differences.

For the upper bound we need to prove that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist a  $K$  such that for any  $k > K$  and for any  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_s^k$  with  $\frac{H_k(\nu_k)}{k} \in C$ , there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s$  with  $h(\mu) \in C$  and such that inequality (6.4) holds. This can be done considering  $\mu = \frac{\nu_1^M + \dots + \nu_k^M}{k}$ , where  $\nu_i^M \in \mathcal{M}_s$  is the unique  $(i-1)$ -step Markov extension of  $\nu_i$ . Due to the fact that  $h$  is affine on  $\mathcal{M}_s$ , we have in fact that  $h(\mu) = \frac{H_k(\nu_k)}{k}$ .

The proof of the lower bound is similar. We omit the details.

The convexity of  $\mathbf{I}$  follows from the fact that the maps  $h(\cdot), h(\cdot|\rho) : \mathcal{M}_s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are affine. Given  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s$  such that  $h(\nu) = x$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s$  such that  $h(\mu) = y$ , then for any  $c \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} h(c\nu + (1-c)\mu) &= cx + (1-c)y \\ h(c\nu + (1-c)\mu|\rho) &= ch(\nu|\rho) + (1-c)h(\mu|\rho). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{I}(cx + (1-c)y) \leq h(c\nu + (1-c)\mu|\rho) = ch(\nu|\rho) + (1-c)h(\mu|\rho) \quad (6.6)$$

If we take the infimum over all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s$  such that  $h(\nu) = x$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s$  such that  $h(\mu) = y$  from (6.6) one obtains the convexity of  $\mathbf{I}$ .

Theorem 3.1 is proved.

**6.2. Proof of Theorem 3.2.** The proof of theorem 3.2 is similar to that of Theorem 3.1, so we leave the details to the reader.

**6.3. Proof of Proposition 3.3.** Let us recall the following large deviation principle [6]. Let  $x_1^n$  be a sample path distributed according to a  $g$ -measure  $\rho$ . Then the empirical process  $\pi(\cdot; x_1^n)$  defined at (2.11) satisfies a large deviation principle in  $(\mathcal{M}_s, d_w)$  with normalizing factor  $\frac{1}{n}$  and rate function

$$I^\pi(\nu) = h(\nu|\rho). \quad (6.7)$$

Here  $d_w$  is a distance that metrizes weak convergence.

Now we observe that for every fixed  $k$  the entropies upon consideration are continuous in  $(\mathcal{M}_s, d_w)$ . Therefore, the contraction principle [11] immediately yields the proposition.

**6.4. Proof of Proposition 3.4.** We prove that the Legendre transform of  $\mathbf{I}$  is  $\mathbf{R}$ . We know from Theorem 3.1 that  $\mathbf{I}$  is a convex function and this imply the Legendre duality.

We have

$$\sup_{u \in [0, \log |A|]} \left\{ tu - \inf_{\{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s : h(\nu) = u\}} h(\nu|\rho) \right\} = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s} \{ \mathbb{E}_\nu [\phi] + th(\nu) + h(\nu) \}. \quad (6.8)$$

If  $t > -1$ , then we get by applying the variational principle

$$(6.8) = (t+1) \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \frac{\phi}{t+1} \right] + h(\nu) \right\} = (t+1) P_{top} \left( \frac{\phi}{t+1} \right).$$

It  $t < -1$ , we get

$$(6.8) = (t+1) \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \frac{\phi}{t+1} \right] + h(\nu) \right\}.$$

Observe that  $h(\nu) \geq 0$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s$ . Moreover, the set of measures with entropy 0 is dense in  $\mathcal{M}_s$  (wrt weak topology), see e.g. [12]. Hence, for  $t < -1$ , (6.8) =  $(t+1) \inf \{ \mathbb{E}_\eta [\phi/(t+1)] : \eta \in \mathcal{M}_s \}$ . The case  $t = -1$  is trivial.

The identification of  $\mathbf{R}(t)$  with the scaled cumulant generating functions (formula (3.5)) follows from general arguments [11].

It is interesting to notice that using the combinatorial properties of types and the results of Section 5 it is possible to prove (3.5) directly. We just sketch the proof.

Following arguments already used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{x_1^n \in A^n} e^{nt \hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)} \rho([x_1^n]) \leq \\ & \sup_{\nu_{k(n)} \in \mathcal{M}_s^{k(n)}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\nu_{k(n)}} [\phi_{k(n)}] + (t+1) h_{k(n)}(\nu_{k(n)}) \right\} + \overline{R}_n \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{x_1^n \in A^n} e^{nt \hat{h}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)} \rho([x_1^n]) \geq \\ & \sup_{\nu_{k(n)} \in \mathcal{U}^{k(n)}(A^n)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\nu_{k(n)}} [\phi_{k(n)}] + (t+1) h_{k(n)}(\nu_{k(n)}) \right\} + \underline{R}_n \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

where  $\overline{R}_n$  and  $\underline{R}_n$  are correcting terms converging to zero.

We now compute the supremum in (6.9).

If  $t \leq -1$ , the function to be maximized is convex and the supremum is attained at one of the extremal points of  $\mathcal{M}_s^k$ , which has entropy zero by virtue of lemma 5.1. Hence the supremum in question equals

$$\sup\{\mathbb{E}_{\nu_{k(n)}}[\phi_{k(n)}] : \nu_{k(n)} \in \mathcal{E}^{k(n)}\}. \quad (6.11)$$

If  $t > -1$ , the supremum in (6.9) is equal to

$$(t+1) \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_s} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \frac{\phi_{k(n)}}{t+1} \right] + h(\nu) \right\} = (t+1) P_{top} \left( \frac{\phi_{k(n)}}{t+1} \right).$$

To see this, we first notice that if  $\nu$  is the  $(k(n)-1)$ -step Markov measure having  $\nu_{k(n)}$  as  $k(n)$ -marginals, then  $h_k(\nu_{k(n)}) = h(\nu)$ . On another hand, the variational principle tells us that  $\mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi_{k(n)}/(t+1)] + h(\nu)$  attains its supremum precisely at a unique  $(k(n)-1)$ -step Markov measure because  $\phi_{k(n)}$  is a  $k(n)$ -cylindrical function. This supremum equals  $P_{top}(\phi_{k(n)}/(t+1))$ .

It is not difficult to prove now that the limit when  $n \rightarrow \infty$  of the upper bound coincide with  $\mathbf{R}(t)$ . Using the results of Section 5 it is also possible to prove that the lower bound has the same limit.

The result for the estimator  $\frac{\hat{H}_{k(n)}(x_1^n)}{k(n)}$  can be deduced from the previous result using the fact that  $(\hat{h}_i(x_1^n))_i$  is a bounded decreasing sequence and

$$\hat{H}_k(x_1^n) = \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{h}_i(x_1^n). \quad (6.12)$$

**6.5. Proof of Proposition 3.5.** The proof of this proposition is very simple and left to the reader. It is possible to get (3.7) directly using the combinatorics of types.

**6.6. Proof of Proposition 3.6.** When the variations of  $\phi$  are square summable the map  $\beta \mapsto P_{top}(\beta\phi)$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , is continuously differentiable and strictly convex. This can be deduced from [25]; The extension of their proofs to the square summable case is straightforward. This imply that the map  $\mathbf{R}$  is continuously differentiable and strictly convex in the interval  $(-1, \infty)$ . Moreover  $\mathbf{R}(0) = 0$  and  $\frac{d\mathbf{R}}{dt}(0) = h(\rho)$ . This establishes the first part of the proposition.

We now turn to prove the representation formula (3.9). First introduce the following auxiliary function of  $\beta \in [0, +\infty)$ :

$$\mathcal{I}(\beta) \stackrel{def}{=} \inf\{h(\nu|\rho) : \nu \in \mathcal{M}_s, h(\nu) = h(\rho_{\beta\phi})\}.$$

We now claim that  $\mathcal{I}(\beta) = h(\rho_{\beta\phi}|\rho)$ . The proof is by contradiction of the variational principle. Assume that  $\eta \neq \rho_{\beta\phi}$  is such that

$$h(\eta|\rho) \leq h(\rho_{\beta\phi}|\rho) \quad \text{and} \quad h(\eta) = h(\rho_{\beta\phi}).$$

This means that (remember (2.10))

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta[\phi] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\beta\phi}}[\phi].$$

Multiplying this inequality by  $\beta > 0$  and adding  $h(\eta)$  to the lhs and  $h(\rho_{\beta\phi})$  to the rhs (since these two quantities are indeed equal by hypothesis) yields

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta[\beta\phi] + h(\eta) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\beta\phi}}[\beta\phi] + h(\rho_{\beta\phi}).$$

But the variational principle tells that the rhs is equal to the supremum over all shift-invariant measures  $\nu$  of  $\mathbb{E}_\nu[\beta\phi] + h(\nu)$  and is attained only for  $\nu = \rho_{\beta\phi}$ . Therefore  $\eta$  must be equal to  $\rho_{\beta\phi}$ . In this instance of the variational principle, we used

the fact that if a potential  $\phi$  has square summable variations, then  $\beta\phi$  also has square summable variations, in particular for any  $\beta > 0$ .<sup>(2)</sup>

We now invoke lemma 6.1 hereafter to define a map  $\mathcal{H} : [0, +\infty[ \rightarrow ]h_\infty, \log |A|]$  defined as  $\mathcal{H}(\beta) = h(\rho_{\beta\phi})$ . Since this map is continuous, strictly decreasing, to each  $u \in ]h_\infty, \log |A|]$  we can associate a unique  $\beta_u$  such that  $h(\rho_{\beta_u}) = u$ .

The last statement of the proposition follows from the first comment in Section 4.  $\square$

We state and prove the lemma used just above.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Assume that  $\phi$  has square summable variations (hence so has  $\beta\phi$  for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ ) and is not cohomologous to a constant<sup>(3)</sup>. Then the map  $\beta \mapsto h(\rho_{\beta\phi})$  is continuous, strictly decreasing on  $[0, +\infty[$  and  $h(\rho_{\beta\phi}) \in ]h_\infty, \log |A|]$ .*

**Proof.** By the variational principle,  $h(\rho_{\beta\phi}) = P_{top}(\beta\phi) - \beta \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\beta\phi}}[\phi]$ . (This shows continuity.)  $\beta \mapsto P_{top}(\beta\phi)$  is strictly decreasing (since  $\phi < 0$ ) and strictly convex (see above). This strict convexity of the pressure can be translated as follows [19]

$$\beta_1 < \beta_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\beta_1\phi}}[\phi] < \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\beta_2\phi}}[\phi].$$

Therefore we get that  $\beta \mapsto h(\rho_{\beta\phi})$  is strictly decreasing when  $\beta > 0$ . It is obvious from the variational principle that  $h(\rho_{\beta\phi}) = \log |A|$  when  $\beta = 0$ . Since  $h(\rho_{\beta\phi})$  is bounded from below by 0,  $h_\infty = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} h(\rho_{\beta\phi})$  exists. This ends the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

## 7. PROOF OF SOME LEMMAS

This section contains the proof of the lemmas of Section 5.

Let us introduce the following graph theoretical representations that we will use in the proofs of the lemmas. We call  $\mathcal{N}_n^k$  the set of integer-valued maps  $N_n^k : A^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\sum_{a_1^k \in A^k} N_n^k(a_1^k) = n \quad (7.1)$$

and

$$\sum_{b \in A} N_n^k(a_1^{k-1}b) = \sum_{b \in A} N_n^k(ba_1^{k-1}) \quad \forall a_1^{k-1} \in A^{k-1}. \quad (7.2)$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}_n^k$  be the subset of  $\mathcal{M}_s^k$  whose elements are obtained by normalizing elements in  $\mathcal{N}_n^k$ , i.e.

$$\mathcal{L}_n^k = \left\{ \nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_s^k : \exists N_n^k \in \mathcal{N}_n^k \text{ s.t. } \nu_k(\cdot) = \frac{N_n^k(\cdot)}{n} \right\}. \quad (7.3)$$

If  $k = 1$  then  $\mathcal{U}^1(A^n) = \mathcal{L}_n^1$ , otherwise a strict inclusion holds  $\mathcal{U}^k(A^n) \subset \mathcal{L}_n^k$  ( $n > 1$ ).

We will call a  $k$ -order compatible balanced directed multigraph ( $k$ -multigraph,  $k$ -M, for short) a directed multigraph with the following properties: The vertices are labeled with elements of  $A^{k-1}$ ; For each vertex the number of outgoing arrows is equal to the number of ingoing arrows; An arrow can go from the vertex  $a_1^{k-1}$  to the vertex  $b_1^{k-1}$  if and only if  $a_2^{k-1} = b_1^{k-2}$ . This arrow inherits the natural label  $a_1^{k-1}b^{k-1}$  (note that several arrows can have the same label).

<sup>2</sup>In case of non-uniqueness, the claim still holds but  $\rho_{\beta\phi}$  is *any* equilibrium state associated to  $\beta\phi$  since relative entropy only depends on  $\beta\phi$ .

<sup>3</sup>I.e. is not the equilibrium measure for a potential of the form  $V - V \circ T + c$ , where  $V$  is a measurable function,  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . In this case the equilibrium measure would coincide with the measure of maximal entropy, the uniform Bernoulli measure.

Given an element  $N_n^k \in \mathcal{N}_n^k$  we represent it with a  $k$ -M containing  $n$  arrows ([11], section II.2) drawing  $N_n^k(b_1^k)$  directed edges from the vertex associated to  $b_1^{k-1}$  to the one associated to  $b_2^k$ .

Conversely, given a  $k$ -M containing  $n$  arrows, then it is possible to associate to it an element of  $\mathcal{N}_n^k$  defining  $N_n^k(a_1^k)$  as the number of arrows going from  $a_1^{k-1}$  to  $a_2^k$ . This gives a bijective correspondence.

To each element  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{U}^k(A^n)$ , we associate the element  $N_n^k = n\nu_k \in \mathcal{N}_n^k$ . Then we construct a  $k$ -M as before, which is connected (note that we are not considering vertices without ingoing/outgoing arrows). Given two vertices  $a_1^{k-1}$  and  $b_1^{k-1}$  which have some ingoing/outgoing arrows, there exist  $i < j$  with  $|i - j| < n$  such that  $\tilde{x}_i^{i+k-2} = a_1^{k-1}$  and  $\tilde{x}_j^{j+k-2} = b_1^{k-1}$ . This means that for any  $i \leq l < j$  there exists at least one arrow with label  $\tilde{x}_l^{l+k-1}$ , i.e., at least one path from the vertex  $a_1^{k-1}$  to the vertex  $b_1^{k-1}$ .

Conversely given a connected  $k$ -M we associate to it an element of  $\mathcal{U}^k(A^n)$ . A connected  $k$ -M has at least one Eulerian circuit (see for example [3] section I.3). One follows the circuit generating a sample path in the following way: Every time one goes through an arrow with label  $a_1^k$ , one concatenates the element  $a_k$ . The sample path  $x_1^n$  that you obtain in this way is such that  $n\pi(\cdot; x_1^n)$  has associated the connected  $k$ -M one started with.

This is a bijective correspondence between  $\mathcal{U}^k(A^n)$  and the subclass of connected  $k$ -M containing  $n$  arrows. This correspondence says that it is possible, starting from the  $k$ -M associated to an element  $\pi_{k,n} \in \mathcal{U}^k(A^n)$ , to construct an element  $x_1^n \in \tau_{\pi_{k,n}}$  by simply following an Eulerian circuit.

Some classical combinatorial arguments allow to estimate the number of Eulerian circuits of a  $k$ -M and this gives an estimate on the number of samples  $x_1^n \in \tau_{\pi_{k,n}}$  (see [11] section II.2):

$$\frac{\prod_{a_1^{k-1}} \left( n \sum_b \pi_{k,n}(a_1^{k-1}b) - 1 \right)!}{\prod_{a_1^k} (n\pi_{k,n}(a_1^k))!} \leq |\{x_1^n \in \tau_{\pi_{k,n}}\}| \leq n \frac{\prod_{a_1^{k-1}} \left( n \sum_b \pi_{k,n}(a_1^{k-1}b) \right)!}{\prod_{a_1^k} (n\pi_{k,n}(a_1^k))!} \quad (7.4)$$

We will call a  $k$ -order weighted compatible balanced directed graph ( $k$ -weighted graph,  $k$ -WG, for short) a directed graph with the following properties: The vertices are labeled with elements of  $A^{k-1}$ ; To each arrow is associated a nonnegative weight; For each vertex, the sum of the weights associated to outgoing arrows is equal to the sum of the weights associated to ingoing arrows; An arrow can go from the vertex  $a_1^{k-1}$  to the vertex  $b_1^{k-1}$  if and only if  $a_2^{k-1} = b_1^{k-2}$ ; The total sum of the weights is 1.

Given a measure  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_s^k$  we can represent it by a  $k$ -WG and conversely given a  $k$ -WG we can associate to it an element of  $\mathcal{M}_s^k$ .

**7.1. Proof of lemma 5.1.** A convex combination of measures corresponds to a  $k$ -WG with a convex combination of weights. Therefore the extremality property in  $\mathcal{M}_s^k$  corresponds to the extremality property in the set of  $k$ -WG's. Consider a  $k$ -WG having nonzero weights only on arrows forming a single cycle (a loop of successive arrows visiting a vertex no more than once). All the nonzero weights are equal to  $\frac{1}{\ell}$ , where  $\ell$  is the length of the cycle. Every such a  $k$ -WG cannot be obtained as a convex combination of other  $k$ -WG's. Otherwise at least one of them would violate one of the conditions to be a  $k$ -WG. Moreover any  $k$ -WG can be obtained as a convex combination of a finite number of  $k$ -WG's consisting of a single cycle. A decomposition can be obtained by iterating a finite number of times the following procedure. Take the(an) arrow to which is associated the minimum weight and consider a cycle containing it. Subtract the minimum weight to all the arrows



belonging to the cycle and add the  $k$ -WG consisting of the single cycle weighted by  $\frac{m.w.}{\ell}$ , where  $m.w.$  = minimum weight, to the convex decomposition. This gives a complete characterization of  $\mathcal{E}^k$ . A direct consequence is that  $h_k(\nu_k) = 0$  for every  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{E}^k$ . This is because for every measure  $\nu_k$  with associated a  $k$ -WG consisting of a single cycle  $\nu_k(a_k|a_1^{k-1})$  can be only zero or one. The lemma is proved.

**7.2. Proof of lemma 5.2.** Given a measure  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_s^k$  it is possible to construct a measure  $\tilde{\mu}_k \in \mathcal{L}_n^k$  such that  $\|\tilde{\mu}_k - \nu_k\|_{tv} \leq \frac{2A^k}{n}$ . This is trivial when  $k = 1$  and a little bit more tricky when  $k > 1$  because of the stationarity condition (2.1). Consider for any arrow from  $a_1^{k-1}$  to  $a_2^k$  the following parameter

$$\gamma(a_1^k) = \min \left\{ \left| \nu_k(a_1^k) - \frac{[n\nu_k(a_1^k)] + 1}{n} \right|, \left| \nu_k(a_1^k) - \frac{[n\nu_k(a_1^k)]}{n} \right| \right\}. \quad (7.5)$$

where  $[\cdot]$  represent the integer part. Take the (an) arrow with associated the minimum value of  $\gamma$ . Consider an elementary cycle containing  $a_1^k$  and add or subtract (depending if the minimum value in (7.5) was obtained with the first or the second argument) the value  $\gamma(a_1^k)$  to all the elements of the cycle. Fix the values of all the weights whose value is  $\frac{i}{n}$  with  $i$  some integer number  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , and remove them from the  $k$ -WG. It is easy to see that one can iterate this procedure up to fix all the values of the weights. One ends up with some weights which satisfy the stationarity condition but are not necessarily normalized to one. One concludes the procedure by adding or subtracting the weight necessary to have the wanted normalization. One can do this sequentially by using an elementary unit of weight  $\frac{1}{n}$  and adding or subtracting one unit of weight at the same time in elementary cycles, so that the stationarity condition is preserved. This is always possible. The measure  $\tilde{\mu}_k$  that is obtained in this way belongs to  $\mathcal{L}_n^k$  and is such that

$$\|\tilde{\mu}_k - \nu_k\|_{tv} \leq \frac{2|A|^k}{n}.$$

If the  $k$ -M corresponding to  $\tilde{\mu}_k$  is connected then the proof is finished. If the  $k$ -M associated to  $\tilde{\mu}_k$  is not connected let  $m > 1$  be the number of connected components containing respectively  $e(1), \dots, e(m)$  directed edges with  $\sum_{j=1}^m e(j) = n$ . Considering an Eulerian circuit for every component one can associate a sample path  $s(i)$  of length  $e(i)$  to the  $i$ th component for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . The measure  $\tilde{\mu}_k$  has the following expression

$$\tilde{\mu}_k(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{e(j)}{n} \pi_k(\cdot; s(j)). \quad (7.6)$$

Let us now consider the sample path  $s = s(1)s(2) \dots s(m)$  of length  $n$  and construct  $\mu_k$  as the  $k$  empirical measure  $\mu_k(\cdot) = \pi_k(\cdot; s) \in \mathcal{U}^k(A^n)$ . Both  $\mu_k$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_k$  are constructed by sliding windows of width  $k$  along cyclicized samples, and computing frequencies in these windows. Every times the window of size  $k$  is overlapped to the sample  $s$  and do not cross points of separation among different  $s(i)$  the  $k$ -sequence that is matched contributes both in  $\tilde{\mu}_k$  and  $\mu_k$ . Using the fact that  $m \leq A^{k-1}$  we deduce

$$\|\mu_k - \tilde{\mu}_k\|_{tv} \leq \frac{k|A|^{k-1}}{n}. \quad (7.7)$$

Using (7.6), (7.7) and the triangle inequality yields the statement of the lemma.

**7.3. Proof of lemma 5.3.** The proof of inequalities (5.4) and (5.5) is very simple and elegant and can be found in [23]. More precisely in section I.6.d in the case of non cyclicized samples and in section II.1.a in the case of cyclicized samples, which is our case. The proof of inequality (5.6) is obtained from estimate (7.4) and Stirling formula. Inequality (5.5) can be proved in an analogous way.

**7.4. Proof of lemma 5.4.** This lemma can be found in [10] but we give its proof thereafter for the sake of completeness. Consider  $\mu_k$  and  $\nu_k$  two measures in  $\mathcal{M}^k$  such that  $\|\nu_k - \mu_k\|_{tv} \leq \delta$ . Let us set  $\delta_k(a_1^k) = |\nu_k(a_1^k) - \mu_k(a_1^k)|$ . Obviously

$$\sum_{a_1^{k-1}} \delta_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1}) \leq \sum_{a_1^k} \delta_k(a_1^k) \leq \delta.$$

Using triangle inequality one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} |h_k(\nu_k) - h_k(\mu_k)| &\leq \sum_{a_1^k} |\nu_k(a_1^k) \log \nu_k(a_1^k) - \mu_k(a_1^k) \log \mu_k(a_1^k)| \\ &\quad + \sum_{a_1^{k-1}} |\nu_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1}) \log \nu_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1}) - \mu_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1}) \log \mu_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1})|. \end{aligned}$$

By a simple computation it is possible to obtain the modulus of continuity of the function  $-x \log x$  on the interval  $[0, 1]$  when  $\delta$  is small enough

$$\sup_{\{x, y \in [0, 1] : |x - y| \leq \delta\}} |x \log x - y \log y| = -\delta \log \delta.$$

Using this result we get

$$|h_k(\nu_k) - h_k(\mu_k)| \leq - \sum_{a_1^k} \delta_k(a_1^k) \log \delta_k(a_1^k) - \sum_{a_1^{k-1}} \delta_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1}) \log \delta_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1}). \quad (7.8)$$

We write the right hand side of (7.8) as

$$-|A|^k \sum_{a_1^k} \frac{\delta_k(a_1^k)}{|A|^k} \log \delta_k(a_1^k) - |A|^{k-1} \sum_{a_1^{k-1}} \frac{\delta_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1})}{|A|^{k-1}} \log \delta_{k-1}(a_1^{k-1}) \quad (7.9)$$

and apply Jensen inequality using the fact that  $-x \log x$  is a concave function. When  $\delta$  is small enough we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |h_k(\nu_k) - h_k(\mu_k)| &\leq -\delta \log \frac{\delta}{|A|^k} - \delta \log \frac{\delta}{|A|^{k-1}} \\ &\leq -2\delta \log \frac{\delta}{|A|^k}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

The lemma is proved.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Bowen, *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms*, Lecture Notes in Math. **470**, Springer, 1975.
- [2] N. Berger, C. Hoffman, V. Sidoravicius, *Nonuniqueness for specifications in  $\ell^{2+\varepsilon}$* , preprint available at [arXiv](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.00000) (2003).
- [3] B. Bollobas, *Modern graph theory*, Graduate texts in mathematics **184** Springer-Verlag, New-York (1998).
- [4] M. Bramson, S. A. Kalikow, *Nonuniqueness in  $g$ -functions*, Israel J. Math. **84** (1993), 153–160.
- [5] W. Bryc, *A remark on the connection between the large deviation principle and the central limit theorem*, Statist. & Probab. Lett. **18**, 253–256 (1993).
- [6] J.-R. Chazottes, E. Olivier, *Relative entropy, dimensions and large deviations for  $g$ -measures*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33** (2000), 675–689.
- [7] J.-R. Chazottes, E. Ugalde, *Entropy estimation and fluctuations of hitting and recurrence times for Gibbsian sources*, to appear in Discr. & Cont. Dynam. Sys. B.
- [8] Z. Coelho, W. Parry, *Central limit asymptotics for shifts of finite type*, Israel J. Math. **69**, no. 2, 235–249 (1990).
- [9] P. Collet, A. Galves, B. Schmitt, *Repetition times for Gibbsian sources*, Nonlinearity **12** (1999), no. 4, 1225–1237.
- [10] I. Csiszár, J. Körner, *Information theory. Coding theorems for discrete memoryless systems*. Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1981.

- [11] F. Den Hollander, *Large Deviations*, Fields Institute Monographs **14** (2000).
- [12] M. Denker, C. Grillenberger, K. Sigmund, *Ergodic Theory on Compact Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Math. **527**, Springer-Verlag (1976).
- [13] R. Fernández, P.A. Ferrari, A. Galves, *Coupling, renewal and perfect simulation of chains of infinite order*. Lecture Notes for the vth Brazilian school of Probability, Ubatuba, August 2001. 92 pp. (2001). available at <http://www.ime.br/~pablo/publications.html>.
- [14] R. Fernández, G. Maillard, *Chains with complete connections: General theory, uniqueness, loss of memory and mixing properties*, J. Stat. Phys. **118** (2005), no. 3-4, 555–588.
- [15] R. Fernández, G. Maillard, *Chains with complete connections and one-dimensional Gibbs measures*, Electro. J. Probab. **9** (2004), 145–176.
- [16] D. Gabrielli, A. Galves, D. Guiol, *Fluctuations of the empirical entropies for a chain of infinite order*, Math. Phys. Electron. J. **9**, 2003.
- [17] M. Iosifescu, S. Grigorescu, *Dependence with complete connections and its applications*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **96**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [18] A. Johansson, A. Öberg, *Square summability of variations of g-functions and uniqueness of g-measures*, Math. Res. Lett. **10** (2003), no. 5-6, 587–601.
- [19] G. Keller, *Equilibrium states in ergodic theory*, London Math. Soc., Student Texts **42**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.
- [20] F. Ledrappier, *Principe variationnel et systèmes symboliques*, Z. Wahr. Verw. Geb. **30** (1974), 185–202.
- [21] D.S. Ornstein, B. Weiss, *How sampling reveals a process*, Ann. Probab. **18** (1990), 905–930.
- [22] T. Schurmann, P. Grassberger, *Entropy estimation of symbol sequences*. Chaos, **6** (3), 414–427 (1996).
- [23] P.C. Shields, *The ergodic theory of discrete sample paths*, Graduate studies in mathematics **13** (1996).
- [24] P.C. Shields, private communication.
- [25] F. Takens, E. Verbitskiy, *Multifractal analysis of local entropies for expansive homeomorphisms with specification*, Comm. Math. Phys. **203** (1999), no. 3, 593–612.
- [26] P. Walters, *Invariant measures and equilibrium states for some mappings which expand distances*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **236** (1978), 121–153.